REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-46 indicated as rejected. Applicants first note that only claims 1-11, 20-25 and 31-46 are presently pending in the application. Claims 12-19 and 26-30 were previously canceled in the response to the Restriction Requirement filed on February 21, 2003. Accordingly, the present response reproduces the pending claims, without amendment, and includes claims 1-11, 20-25 and 31-46.. All the pending claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, and their reconsideration is requested.

All of the pending claims were rejected for a sole reason, as being anticipated by Nick. The application currently includes 5 independent claims, namely claims 1, 20, 31, 34 and 42. By the previous response, Applicants stressed that the Nick reference fails to teach the configuration of memory objects within devices based upon a database that is used to define and solicit orders for an electrical system. Applicants reiterate that this feature is nowhere supported by the Nick reference.

All of the independent claims, in similar terminology, recite configuring memory objects or programming programmable components based upon such a database. The database is generated for the programmable devices or components, and is used for soliciting an order and assembling a system. As noted in the present application, the use of the *same* database for configuring and selling the system, and for *programming* the components specified greatly enhances the efficiency and consistency between design, sale and implementation.

In the body of the Office Action, the Examiner pointed to Figure 10 and column 19, lines 46-67 of the Nick reference as disclosing configuring memory objects within devices based upon a database. The citation, as referenced specifically to claim 1, was simply referred to with respect to all of the other independent claims. Accordingly, the passage is similarly addressed here.

Figure 10 of Nick shows a diagram of modules for defining a system, that begins with customer specifications, inputs from sales engineers and materials managers, and ends with manufacturing instructions and shipment information. However, the figure does not disclose, and certainly does not include, the actual configuration of the components, that is, the programming of the components based upon any database, either the product database or the inventory database of Figure 10.

The passage relied upon by the Examiner at column 19 reads as follows:

> If the specified features or components are valid in a standard switchboard, the product selector program invokes the switchboard configuration program module to design a standard switchboard including the specified features or components. This standard switchboard design is the basis for either a quote or a list of components and manufacturing instructions for an order. The list of components and manufacturing instructions is past to the MRP system program 224.
>
> The MRP system program manages an inventory data base 229 and schedules the ordering of parts and the timing of manufacturing operations. The status of the parts inventory and the schedule for manufacturing operations can be reviewed by a MRP manager 230 at a computer terminal 231. A digital computer system 220 also is programmed with an order-to-payment system 232 that manages and automates all order entry, billing, invoicing, and shipping information processed for all standard as well as custom switchboard orders. The digital computer system 220 provides seamless integration of the order-to-payment functions with the functions of the product selector 223, the switchboard configuration program module 225, and the MRP system program 224.

Note that the text reproduced here does not completely correspond to the passage referred to by the Examiner because that passage does not begin and end with a complete sentence. The remaining text, particularly the text of columns 20-23 has also been reviewed, but *no reference whatsoever* can be found to configuring or programming the memory objects of devices, or programmable components based upon the database. On

the contrary, the database is *only* used as the basis for specifying parts, computing prices, costs and delivery time, and for creating drawings.

As noted above, the further step provided by the invention of configuring memory objects or programming programmable components adds a dimension to the design and sales process heretofore unknown. That is, where programming information, such as component function, component configuration, component location in the system, and so forth are useful in the subsequent manufacturing and operation of the system, the use of the database which serves to specify the system from the outset greatly enhances the manufacturing process. Nick simply does not teach or suggest the use of any of the database or configuration information for configuring memory objects within specified devices or for programming programmable components. Indeed, Nick does not even describe, in any way, how any programmable components or configurable memory objects would be programmed following assembly.

On this same point, the Examiner included responses to the arguments advanced in the previous Office Action exchange. On page 7 of the current Office Action, the Examiner concludes simply that:

> This standard switchboard design is the basis for either a quote or a list of components and manufacturing instructions for an order. The list of components and manufacturing instructions is past to the MRP system program 224 (column 19, lines 46-67).

This is the same passage relied upon by the Examiner in the body of the Office Action, reproduced above. As observed above, the passage does not include any suggestion whatsoever for configuring memory objects or programming programmable components.

Continuing with the Examiner's response to the arguments, the Examiner notes that the two databases illustrated in Figure 10 of Nick are used in "product configurations." It is believed that the Examiner may have confused the term "product configurations" as used in Nick with the "configuring" of memory objects recited in certain of the claims. In particular, as clearly described in the present application, and as recited in claim 1, for example, "memory objects within the devices," which are programmable devices according the claim, are configured based upon the established database. The fortuitous use of the term "configuration" in these two contexts should not lead to their confusion. As used in the present claims, and as clearly defined in the application, configuration of memory objects is *programming*. That is, data is stored in the memory objects of the devices themselves. Where Nick employs the term "configuration" this term is simply synonymous with "arrangement," "design," and so forth.

The latter point is made even more clear in the case of other independent claims, such as claims 20, 31 and 42, where the term "configuring" does not even appear.

In conclusion, it is clear that the Nick reference does not fairly disclose or suggest configuring memory objects or programming programmable components based upon a database used to design, solicit orders for and assemble an engineered electrical system. Accordingly, all of the pending claims are believed to be allowable over Nick, and their reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/14/2003

Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS
ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, LLC
Patent Department/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204
Attention: Mr. Alexander Gerasimow
Phone: (414) 382-2000